Applicant: Hirokazu Yamagata et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-037001 / US4920

Serial No.: 09/852,090 Filed: May 10, 2001 Page: 19 of 20

REMARKS

Claims 1-102 are pending in this application, with claims 1-6, 35-40 and 69-74 being independent. Claims 1-15 and 20-34 have been amended and claims 35-102 have been added.

Claims 7, 8, 12 and 15 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's claim interpretation.

Claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 12-17 have been rejected as being anticipated by Shi. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Shi fails to describe or suggest forming a thin film (or a luminous layer) comprising an organic (or luminous) material and a dopant by evaporation with constant evaporation rates of the organic (or luminous) material and the dopant, as recited in each of amended independent claims 1-4. Instead, Shi teaches that, in the organic medium A_xB_y , the A component gradually increases and the B component gradually decreases (see Shi at col. 4, lines 1-4). As this results from changes in the relative evaporation rates of the A and B components, Shi does not describe or suggest using constant evaporation rates.

Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 13, 16 and 21 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kobori. Like Shi, Kobori fails to describe or suggest forming a thin film (or a luminous layer) comprising an organic (or luminous) material and a dopant by evaporation with constant evaporation rates of the organic (or luminous) material and the dopant, as recited in each of amended independent claims 1 and 3. For at least this reason, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-9 and 12-24 have been rejected as being obvious over Kobori in view of Peng and Shi. Like claims 3 and 4, amended independent claims 5 and 6 recite forming a luminous layer comprising a luminous material and a dopant by evaporation with constant evaporation rates of the luminous material and the dopant. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Peng nor Shi remedies the failure of Kobori to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims, as discussed above.

Claims 10 and 25-29 have been rejected as being obvious over Kobori in view of Peng, Shi and Singh. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Applicant: Hirokazu Yamagata et al.

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-037001 / US4920

Serial No.: 09/852,090 Filed: May 10, 2001

Page : 20 of 20

Singh does not remedy the failure of Kobori, Peng and Shi to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims, as discussed above.

Claims 11 and 30-34 have been rejected as being obvious over Kobori in view of Peng and Yamada. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Yamada does not remedy the failure of Kobori and Peng to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims, as discussed above.

For the reasons discussed above, applicants request allowance of claims 1-34. Applicants also request allowance of new claims 35-102 because the cited references do not describe or suggest instantaneously stopping or starting the evaporation of the dopant while continuing the evaporation of the organic material, as recited in each of independent claims 35-40, or maintaining a concentration of the dopant along the depth direction at a constant level, as recited in each of independent claims 69-74. For example, as noted above, Shi gradually changes the concentrations of the different components.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$2,342 for excess claim fees (\$2,232) and the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$110). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 98/03

John F. Hayden

Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C. 1425 K Street, N.W. 11th Floor Washington, DC 20005-3500

Telephone: (202) 783-5070 Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40169628.doc